

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

Artkyeam S. Moore,)	Civil Action No.: 8:13-cv-01540-TLW-JDA
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	<u>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</u>
)	<u>OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE</u>
Officers Matoniwie and Jackson,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff brought this action pro se, seeking relief pursuant to Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983. [Doc. 1.] On June 18, 2013, the Court issued an order authorizing service of process and advising Plaintiff of his duty to keep the Court informed of his current address. [Doc. 8.] Subsequently, summons were issued and Defendants answered the Complaint on July 12, 2013. [Doc. 15.] On October 9, 2013, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. [Doc. 26.] On October 10, 2013, the Court issued an Order in accordance with *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising Plaintiff of the summary judgment/dismissal procedure and of the possible consequences if he failed to adequately respond to the motion. [Doc. 27.] The *Roseboro* Order was returned to the Court as undeliverable because Plaintiff had been released from the Florence County Detention Center, where he had been detained. [Doc. 29.] Plaintiff failed to file a response to Defendants' summary judgment motion and has never apprised the Court of his new address. On May 6, 2014, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss for failure to prosecute, noting that Plaintiff neither updated his address with the Clerk's Office as required by Court Order, nor responded to the motion for summary judgment. [Doc. 31.]

Based on the foregoing, it appears Plaintiff no longer wishes to pursue this action. “The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recognize that courts must have the authority to control litigation before them, and this authority includes the power to order dismissal of an action for failure to comply with court orders.” *Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93, 95 (4th Cir. 1989) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)). “Federal courts possess an inherent authority to dismiss cases with prejudice *sua sponte*.” *Gantt v. Md. Div. of Corr.*, 894 F. Supp. 226, 229 (D. Md. 1995) (citing *Link v. Wabash R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626 (1962); *White v. Raymark Indust., Inc.*, 783 F.2d 1175 (4th Cir. 1986); *Zaczek v. Fauquier Cnty., Va.*, 764 F. Supp. 1071, 1074 (E.D. Va.1991)).

The Fourth Circuit, in *Davis v. Williams*, recognizing that dismissal with prejudice is a harsh sanction that should not be invoked lightly, set forth four factors for determining whether Rule 41(b) dismissal is appropriate:

- (1) the degree of personal responsibility on the part of the plaintiff;
- (2) the amount of prejudice to the defendant caused by the delay;
- (3) the presence or absence of a drawn out history of deliberately proceeding in a dilatory fashion; and
- (4) the effectiveness of sanctions less drastic than dismissal.

588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978) (citing *McCargo v. Hedrick*, 545 F.2d 393, 396 (4th Cir. 1976)). Subsequently, however, the Fourth Circuit noted that “the four factors . . . are not a rigid four-pronged test,” and whether to dismiss depends on the particular circumstances of the case. *Ballard*, 882 F.2d at 95. For example, in *Ballard*, the court reasoned that “the Magistrate's explicit warning that a recommendation of dismissal would result from failure to obey his order is a critical fact that distinguishes this case from those cited by appellant. . . . In view of the warning, the district court had little alternative to dismissal. Any other

course would have placed the credibility of the court in doubt and invited abuse.” *Id.* at 95–96.

As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, he is personally responsible for his failure to advise the Court of his current address. The Court specifically warned Plaintiff the case would be subject to dismissal if he failed to update his address and thereby failed to meet a Court deadline. [Doc. 8 at 3.] Despite this explanation, Plaintiff has elected not to update his address and, as a result, has failed to respond to the Court's Orders. Because Plaintiff has already ignored the Court's directive to keep the Court apprised of his address, sanctions less drastic than dismissal would not be effective.

Wherefore, based upon the foregoing, the Court recommends the case be DISMISSED pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). The Court recommends granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss [Doc. 31] and denying Defendants' motion for summary judgment [Doc. 26] as moot.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

s/Jacquelyn D. Austin
United States Magistrate Judge

May 7, 2014
Greenville, South Carolina